

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is objected to because the word "birefrigent" should be spelled --birefringent--. In response, the word birefringent has been changed and accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nilsson (U.S. Patent 5,177,764). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The laser gyro recited in claim 1 comprises an optical ring cavity, a solid-state amplifying medium and a feedback system,

the cavity and the amplifying medium being such that two counterpropagating optical modes can propagate in opposite directions one with respect to the other inside said optical cavity, the feedback system allowing the intensity of the two counterpropagating modes to be kept almost the same, the feedback system comprising . . . control means for controlling at least one of the effects of said devices.

In Nilsson, only one counterpropagating optical mode can propagate in the ring laser. No feedback system is described with control means. Further, the means described in Nilsson have the opposite effects of claim 1. In Nilsson, the optical means induces unidirectional oscillation and the optical means induces bidirectional oscillations. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the ring laser described in Nilsson to obtain a ring laser with opposite effects.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 should be patentable over Nilsson. Claims 2-11 recited additional, important limitations, and should be patentable over Nilsson for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson in view of Aronowitz (U.S. Patent 3,867,034). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Aronowitz does not overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Nilsson. Further, claim 10 recites additional limitations. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nilsson in view of Brasseur et al. (U.S. Patent 6,731,423). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Brasseur et al. does not overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Nilsson. Further, claim 15 recites additional limitations. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

(703) 684-1111

(703) 518-5499 Facsimile

Date: August 9, 2007

KMB/jad